



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,796	10/17/2000	Craig L. Ogg	39477/RRT/S850	3181

23363 7590 07/24/2006

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP  
PO BOX 7068  
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER
----------

REAGAN, JAMES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 07/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/690,796

Applicant(s)

OGG, CRAIG L.

Examiner

James A. Reagan

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10,17,22,42,50-52,55-59,61,92,107,108,110,113 and 114 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 5-10, 17, 22, 42, 50-52, 55, 57-59, 61, 92, 107, 108, 110, 113, and 114 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 56 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Status of Claims**

1. This action is in reply to the response filed on 01 May 2006.
2. Claims 1, 5-10, 17, 22, 42, 50-52, 55-59, 61, 92, 107, 108, 110, 113, and 114 have been examined.

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

3. The Information Disclosure Statement filed has been considered. An initialed copy of the Form 1449 is enclosed herewith.

## **RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS**

4. Applicant's arguments received on 01 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Referring to the previous Office action, Examiner has cited relevant portions of the references as a means to illustrate the systems as taught by the prior art. As a means of providing further clarification as to what is taught by the references used in the first Office action, Examiner has expanded the teachings for comprehensibility while maintaining the same grounds of rejection of the claims, except as noted above in the section labeled "Status of Claims." This information is intended to assist in illuminating the teachings of the references while providing evidence that establishes further support for the rejections of the claims.

The Examiner thanks the applicant for pointing out the priority data regarding Cordery et al (6,957,196). All references to this reference are hereby removed from the pending rejections.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, in an effort to elucidate the applicability of the selected prior art, the Examiner has provided a riposte to the Applicant's arguments. With regard to the limitations of claim 1, Applicant argues that the prior art of record does not fully disclose or fairly suggest *a plurality of cryptographic modules, each of the plurality of cryptographic modules for authenticating, processing value for the VBI, and generating indicia data for the plurality of users*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2) describes a software based PSD system that contains a plurality of cryptographic modules. Applicant also argues that the prior art of record does not fully disclose or fairly suggest *...the respective cryptographic module retrieves the data record for the given user from the database*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2), describes database functionality. Clearly, these steps and steps equivalent to them have been known in the art to those of at least ordinary skill, evidenced by the Applicant's inclusion into the background of the specification, which describes the known prior art and the state of the art. With regard to the repertory steps of claim 50, repetition of accessing a database is not only inherent, but necessary.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

5. Claim 56 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3621

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 5-10, 17, 22, 42, 50-52, 55, 57-59, 61, 92, 107, 108, 110, 113, and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 3 103 as being unpatentable over Cordery et al (6,466,921) in view of Pierce et al(6,151,591) and Rosenzweig et al (6,081,810) and either Gupta et al (6226752) or Rosen (5,621,797), and further in view of Applicant's own admissions.

Regarding claim 1, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose a means for secure online value printing including a server, secure database, and cryptographic module and password authentication substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention are the use of specific executable code and plurality of modules. It is noted that the use of digital signatures in a digital environment to create a virtual method or system appears to be functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. It is also obvious to replicate existing structures as shown by the cryptographic modules 22 of Cordery et al (see 196, Fig 1, Col. 2 lines 45-55) controlled by a database. Pierce et al (See Figs. 1,2,4-7, Col. 6, lines 60-65, Col. 7, lines 10-25, and Cols 9 and 10) show password authentication and software code to execute same. Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cordery et al because resource manager intervening interfaces are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. With regard to the limitations of *a plurality of cryptographic modules, each of the plurality of cryptographic modules for authenticating, processing value for the VBI, and generating indicia data for the plurality of users*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2) describes a software based PSD system that contains a plurality of cryptographic modules.

Applicant also argues that the prior art of record does not fully disclose or fairly suggest ...*the respective cryptographic module retrieves the data record for the given user from the database.* Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2), describes database functionality. Clearly, these steps and steps equivalent to them have been known in the art to those of at least ordinary skill, evidenced by the Applicant's inclusion into the background of the specification, which describes the known prior art and the state of the art.

Regarding the password limitations of claim 5, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations because if password authentication fails used a normally logged out (See Fig. 7 of Lee et al 5,742,683).

Regarding database limitations of claim 6, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database limitations of claim 7, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison and ends transaction if comparison fails (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database limitations of claim 8, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims

1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database backup limitations of claim 9, Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup, which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database backup limitations of claim 10, Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup, which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding updating limitations of claim 17, Cordery et al (See Fig. 3, Col. 9, lines 30-40 and 55-60 and claims 10-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including data freshness updating which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding error limitations of claim 22, it is obvious to include error correction in all digital systems especially cryptographic systems because of the irrecoverable data loss resulting from digital error.

Regarding postal limitations of claim 42, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col. 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online postal printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding claim 50, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col. 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose a method for secure online value printing including a server, clients secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific executable code and updating a database. It is noted that the

use of digital signatures in a digital environment to create a virtual method or system appears to be functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Cordery et al (see 196, Fig 1, Col. 2 lines 45-55) shows cryptographic modules 22 controlled by a database controlled by a database that updates meter records. Pierce et al (See Figs. 1,2,4-7, Col. 6, lines 60-65, Col. 7, lines 10-25, and Cols 9 and 10) show password authentication and software code to execute same. Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup. It is also noted that updating a database is a standard database function, otherwise resort can be had to either Gupta et al (Col. 11, lines 10-25, Col. 13, lines 20-30) or Rosen (Col. 13, lines 10-0, claims 13 and 16). It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cordery et al because resource manager intervening interfaces are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. With regard to the limitations of *a plurality of cryptographic modules, each of the plurality of cryptographic modules for authenticating, processing value for the VBI, and generating indicia data for the plurality of users*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2) describes a software based PSD system that contains a plurality of cryptographic modules. Applicant also argues that the prior art of record does not fully disclose or fairly suggest *...the respective cryptographic module retrieves the data record for the given user from the database*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2), describes database functionality. Clearly, these steps and steps equivalent to them have been known in the art to those of at least ordinary skill, evidenced by the Applicant's inclusion into the background of the specification, which describes the known prior art and the state of the art.

Regarding cryptographic limitations of claim 51, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including record encryption which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database limitations of claim 52, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database limitations of claim 55, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database limitations of claim 57, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database backup limitations of claim 58, Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database backup limitations of claim 59, Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding plurality limitations of claim 61, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-10, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, one or more cryptographic modules and password authentication) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding claim 92, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose a means for secure online value printing including a server, secure database, and cryptographic module and password authentication substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific executable code and updating a database. It is noted that the use of digital signatures in a digital environment to create a virtual method or system appears to be functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Cordery et al (see 196, Fig 1, Col. 2 lines 45-55) shows cryptographic modules 22 controlled by a database controlled by a database that updates meter records. Pierce et al (See Figs. 1,2,4-7, Col. 6, lines 60-65, Col. 7, lines 10-25, and Cols 9 and 10) show password authentication and software code to execute same. Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup. It is also noted that updating a database is a standard database function, otherwise resort can be had to either Gupta et al (Col. 11, lines 10-25, Col. 13, lines 20-30) or Rosen (Col. 13, lines 10-30, claims 13 and 16). It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cordery et al because resource manager intervening interfaces are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. With regard to the limitations of a *plurality of cryptographic modules, each of the plurality of cryptographic modules for authenticating, processing value for the VBI, and generating indicia data for the plurality of users*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2) describes a software based PSD system that contains a plurality of cryptographic modules. Applicant also argues that the prior art of record does not fully disclose or fairly suggest *...the respective cryptographic module retrieves the data record for the given user from the database*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2), describes database functionality. Clearly, these steps and steps equivalent to them have been known in the art to those of at least ordinary skill, evidenced by the Applicant's inclusion into the background of the specification, which describes the known prior art and the state of the art.

Regarding claim 107, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose a method for secure online value printing including a server, secure database, and cryptographic module and password authentication substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific executable code and updating a database. It is noted that the use of digital signatures in a digital environment to create a virtual method or system appears to be functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Cordery et al (see 196, Fig 1, Col. 2 lines 45-55) shows cryptographic modules 22 controlled by a database controlled by a database that updates meter records. Pierce et al (See Figs. 1,2,4-7, Col. 6, lines 60-65, Col. 7, lines 10-25, and Cols 9 and 10) show password authentication and software code to execute same. Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup. It is also noted that updating a database is a standard database function; otherwise resort can be had to either Gupta et al (Col. 11, lines 10-25, Col. 13, lines 20-30) or Rosen (Col. 13, lines 10-30, claims 13 and 16). It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cordery et al because resource manager intervening interfaces are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. With regard to the limitations of *a plurality of cryptographic modules, each of the plurality of cryptographic modules for authenticating, processing value for the VBI, and generating indicia data for the plurality of users*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2) describes a software based PSD system that contains a plurality of cryptographic modules. Applicant also argues that the prior art of record does not fully disclose or fairly suggest *...the respective cryptographic module retrieves the data record for the given user from the database*. Applicant, in the background of the specification (see at least page 2), describes database functionality. Clearly, these steps and steps equivalent to them have been known in the art to those of at least ordinary skill, evidenced by the Applicant's inclusion into the background of the specification, which describes the known prior art and the state of the art.

Regarding database backup limitations of claim 108, Rosenzweig et al (See Figs. 3-5, Col. 6, lines 1-5) show database software and backup, which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim because the function of backup is to provide recovery.

Regarding database limitations of claim 110, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database limitations of claim 113, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols: 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Regarding database prevention limitations of claim 114, Cordery et al (See Figs. 1-4, Cols. 2 and 3, Col. 4, lines 24-33, Col. 6, lines 20-55, Col 7, lines 5-65, Col. 8, lines 1-30 and claims 1-13) disclose secure online value printing including a server, secure database, cryptographic module and password authentication including database comparison and ends transaction if comparison fails (See bridging paragraph cols. 9 and 10, element 225) which are conventional functional equivalents of the claim.

Art Unit: 3621

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **James A. Reagan** whose telephone number is **571.272.6710**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **James Trammell** can be reached at **571.272.6712**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> . Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

or faxed to:

**571-273-8300** [Official communications, After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

**571-273-8300** [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window:**

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

**JAMES A. REAGAN**

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3621

14 July 2006

**JAMES A. REAGAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

